

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-7 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is amended and no claims are cancelled or added. The amendments to the claims as indicated herein do not add any new matter to this application.

#### **CLAIMS REJECTION--35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH REJECTION**

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was allegedly not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to practice the invention. This objection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, the Office Action alleges that Claim 1 includes limitations regarding a scan process and a print process that were not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that there was possession of the claimed invention. In response, Applicant has amended Claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

#### **CLAIMS REJECTION—35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH**

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the invention. This objection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, the Office Action alleges that the limitation “the electronic document” has insufficient antecedent basis and “an electronic document” further confuses the issue. In response, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to remove the rejected terms. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

#### **CLAIM REJECTIONS—35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0193895 A1 ("Kaneko") and further in view of U.S. Publication No.2001/0005889 A1 (“Albrecht”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that each of the claims are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons provided hereinafter.

CLAIM 1

Claim 1 recites:

“A multi-function peripheral device comprising:  
a network interface configured to allow the multi-function peripheral device  
to communicate with network devices over a network;  
a graphical user interface configured to allow for the exchange of information  
between the multi-function peripheral device and a user;  
one or more processors;  
a memory;  
a scan process configured to scan one or more documents at the multi-  
function peripheral device;  
a print process configured to print one or more documents at the multi-  
function peripheral device; and  
a virus protection process executing in the memory and being configured to  
perform the steps of:  
**detecting that a request from a network device for particular data  
selected by the network device to be analyzed for viral infection  
has been received by the multi-function peripheral device over the  
network; and**  
**in response to detecting receipt of the request, causing the particular  
data to be provided from the multi-function peripheral device to  
the network device over the network to enable the data to be  
analyzed for viral infection at the network device.”** (Emphasis  
added.)

At least the above-bolded elements of Claim 1 are not taught or suggested by, *Kaneko* and *Albrecht*, either alone or in combination. Claim 1 features, among other things, “**detecting that a request from a network device for particular data selected by the network device to be analyzed for viral infection has been received by the multi-function peripheral device over the network; and in response to detecting receipt of the request, causing the particular data to be provided from the multi-function peripheral device to the network device over the network to enable the data to be analyzed for viral infection at the network device.”**

The Office Action states that *Kaneko* fails to specifically disclose the limitations and that, instead, *Albrecht*, at pars. [0028]-[0029] “dialogue initiation request from 2<sup>nd</sup> computer” and par. [0031] teaches the above identified limitations. (*Office Action*, p. 5). However, the cited sections of *Albrecht* also fail to anticipate the identified limitations.

The Office Action specifically identified *Albrecht*, par. [0029] that states “receive a dialogue initiation request from a second computer also connected to the computer network

concerning an electronic file identified by the second computer as requiring a virus scan.” In *Albrecht*, the first computer is the computer that performs the virus scan and the second computer contains the data that is to be scanned. From paragraph [0029], it is clear that the initiation of the request for a virus scan is from the second computer that contains the data to be scanned. However, in Claim 1, the initiation of the virus scan does not come from the computer that contains the data to be scanned (the MFP device), but instead, the network device itself that performs the virus scan. This creates a distinct advantage as “in the situation where the MFP is infected with a virus, the status data sent by the MFP to the server may contain the virus, which then infects the server.” (*Written Description*, par. [0005]). If the initiation request originated from the MFP as in *Albrecht*, the MFP may in fact infect the network device, or first computer that is to perform the virus scan. Thus, because a detection is not made of the *request from the network device for particular data*, at least one limitation is not taught or suggested by the cited references.

In addition, Claim 1 recites “**detecting that a request from a network device for particular data selected by the network device to be analyzed for viral infection...**” *Albrecht*, on the other hand, discloses “concerning an electronic file *identified by the second computer as requiring a virus scan.*” (*Albrecht*, par. [0029]). In other words, in *Albrecht*, the selection of data is by the second computer that holds the data, not the first computer that performs the virus scan. *Albrecht* does state “identify to the second computer those portions of the electronic file which are required by the first mentioned computer for performing a virus scanning operation at the first computer.” (*Albrecht*, par. [0030]). However, this still does not teach or suggest “**detecting that a request from a network device for particular data selected by the network device to be analyzed for viral infection**” as the *Albrecht* step of “identify[ing] to the second computer those portions of the electronic file” occurs *after* the initial request from the network device that selects the particular data by the network device. Thus, at least another limitation of Claim 1 fails to be taught or suggested by *Albrecht*.

The Office Action relies upon *Kaneko* as allegedly disclosing a multi-function peripheral device that comprises “a network interface...a graphical user interface...a memory...a scan process...a print process...,” and thus the Office Action does not rely upon *Kaneko* as disclosing any of the features of Claim 1 that the Office Action relies upon as being disclosed in *Albrecht*.

Nevertheless, the Applicant has reviewed *Kaneko* and yet found nothing in *Kaneko* related to the features of Claim 1 discussed above.

Because *Kaneko* and *Albrecht*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or in any way render obvious “**detecting that a request from a network device for particular data selected by the network device to be analyzed for viral infection has been received by the multi-function peripheral device over the network; and in response to detecting receipt of the request, causing the particular data to be provided from the multi-function peripheral device to the network device over the network to enable the data to be analyzed for viral infection at the network device,**” the Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons stated above, Claim 1 is allowable over the art of record and is in condition for allowance.

#### CLAIMS 2-7

Claims 2-7 are dependent claims, each of which depends directly or indirectly on Claim 1 discussed above, and thus includes each and every feature of the corresponding independent Claim. Each of Claims 2-7 is therefore allowable for the reasons given above for Claim 1. In addition, each of Claims 2-7 introduces one or more additional limitations that independently render it patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time, although the Applicants reserve the right to further point out the differences between the cited art and the novel features recited in the dependent claims. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-7 are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to Claim 1.

#### CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker LLP

Dated: 8/12/08

/RobertSChee#58554/

Robert S. Chee

Reg. No. 58,554

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, California 95110-1083  
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1213  
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076